IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA AT CHANDIGARH

Crl.Misc.No.38095-M of 2006

Vikramjit Singh

...PETITIONER

VERSUS

State of Punjab

...RESPONDENT

Crl.Misc.No.47865-M of 2006

Ramandeep Singh

...PETITIONER

VERSUS

State of Punjab

...RESPONDENT

DATE OF DECISION: MARCH 6, 2007

CORAM: HON'BLE MR.JUSTICE SATISH KUMAR MITTAL

Present: Mr. Ranjit Sharma, Advocate,
for the petitioner in Crl.Misc.No.38095-M of 2006.
Mr.Sameer Sachdeva, Advocate,
for the petitioner in Crl.Misc.No.47865-M of 2006.
Mr.N.S.Gill, AAG, Punjab.
Mr.Gautam Dutt, Advocate,
for U.T.Chandigarh.

...

This order shall dispose of two Crl.Misc.petitions for anticipatory bail bearing Crl.Misc.No.38095-M of 2006 filed by Vikramjit Singh and Crl.Misc.No.47865-M of 2006 filed by Ramandeep Singh in case FIR No.352 dated 25.12.2005 registered under Sections 420/465/467/468/471/120-B IPC at Police Station Jandiala, Police District Majitha.

I have heard the counsel for the parties.

Counsel for the petitioner contends that in the aforesaid case, false allegations have been levelled against the petitioner. Counsel contends that before lodging the aforesaid FIR, the complainant made a written

complaint to the Senior Superintendent of Police, Chandigarh, copy of which has been annexed as Annexure P-1. In the said complaint, it has been specifically stated that Ramandeep Singh alias Karandeep Singh (petitioner in Crl.Misc.No.47865-M of 2006), has played fraud with him and induced the complainant from making the disputed amount. The said complaint later on was filed by the U.T.Chandigarh police on the statement of the complainant himself to the effect that the matter has been compromised between the parties. Counsel contends that subsequently the above FIR was got registered by the complainant on different facts.

Counsel for the U.T.Chandigarh has confirmed the fact that a complaint was made with Incharge, Economic Offences Wing, Sector 17, Chandigarh and no FIR was registered on the statement of the complainant to the effect that the matter has been compromised between the parties.

Counsel for the petitioners further contends that in terms of the interim orders dated July 6, 2006 and August 22, 2006, both the petitioners have joined the investigation. The factum of joining the investigation has not been disputed by the counsel for the respondent-State.

In view of the aforesaid, the interim orders dated July 6, 2006 and August 22, 2006 are made absolute.

Disposed of accordingly.

March 6, 2007 (SATISH KUMAR MITTAL)
vkg JUDGE